

### REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated April 20, 2005, claims 1-8, 10-13 and 15-31 are pending in the application. Claim 13 was indicated as allowable. The content of 13 was placed into claim 15. Claims 10, 13, 19, and 20 are canceled. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner for reconsideration.

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable by *Hammill* (6,173,178).

Claim 28 has been amended to recite that the up converter frequency and the down converter frequency are changed using a programmable frequency synthesizer. The Examiner has indicated that claim 13 is allowable and this amendment corresponds to claim 13. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claim 28.

Claims 1, 3-5, 10-12, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(e) as being unpatentable over *Hammill* in view of *Wolcott* (6,317,583).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the programmable frequency synthesizer is coupled to the up converter and down converter of a communication control circuit. This was indicated as being allowable in claim 13. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claim 1 as well.

Likewise, claims 3-5 are believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 15 has been amended to recite the limitations of claim 13. Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 15 and are also believed to be allowable.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hammill* in view of *Wolcott* in further view of *Wiswell* (6,205,319).

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. The *Wiswell* reference also does not

teach or suggest the missing limitations of claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claim 2.

Claims 6-7 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hammill* in view of *Wolcott* in further view of *Brown* (6,157,621).

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1 and claims 16-17 depend from claim 15. As mentioned above, both claims 1 and 15 were amended and are believed to be allowable. The *Brown* reference also does not teach or suggest the elements missing from claims 1 and 15. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider this rejection as well.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hammill* in view of *Wolcott* in further view of *Galvin* (6,182,927).

Claim 8 depends from claim 1. The *Galvin* reference does not teach or suggest the elements missing from the *Hammill* and *Wolcott* references. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claim 8.

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hammill* in view of *Pizzicaroli* (5,813,634).

Claim 18 has been amended to include similar limitations to those of claim 13. Claims 19 and 20 have been canceled. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 18 is allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 15.

Claims 21-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hammill* in view of *Pizzicaroli* in further view of *Brown*.


Claims 21-27 are dependent upon amended claim 18. Neither the *Hammill*, *Pizzicaroli* or the *Brown* references teach or suggest the limitations that the up converter frequency and down converter frequency are changed using a programmable frequency synthesizer. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider this rejection as well.

Claims 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hammill* in view of *Brown*.

Claims 29-31 depend from claim 28, which has been amended above in a similar manner to claim 18. Applicant therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection as well.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all objections and rejections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments which would place the application in better condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Georgann S. Grunebach  
Reg. No. 33,179  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: July 12, 2005

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.  
RE/R11/A109  
2250 E. Imperial Highway  
P. O. Box 956  
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956

Telephone: (310) 964-4615